



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,284	06/20/2003	Steve Burns	50277-2139	9791
42425 7590 01/25/2008 HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1083			EXAMINER TSUI, WILSON W	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/600,284

Applicant(s)

BURNS ET AL.

Examiner

Wilson Tsui

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the RCE filed on: 10/02/07
2. Claims 1, 18, 24-46 are amended. Claims 1, and 18 are independent claims.  
Claims 1-46 are pending.
3. The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection for claim 18 is withdrawn, in view of applicant's amendment.
4. The following rejections are withdrawn, in view of new grounds of rejection necessitated by applicant's amendment:
  - Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16-26, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, and 39-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al, in further view of Hofmann et al.
  - Claims 4, 6, 27, and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al and Hofmann et al, in further view of Hind et al
  - Claims 9 – 12, and 32 – 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al, in further view of Burnard et al.
  - Claims 15 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al, and Hofmann et al, in further view of Katariya et al.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by OracleW ("Oracle9iAS Portal Release 2", pages 1-33, published: May 2002).

With regards to claim 1, OracleW teaches a method of rendering a page, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

*generating and storing a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters* (page 11: whereas, mapping information is stored using an interface)

*in response to receiving a request to display the page, performing the steps of:*

*determining that the page is associated with a page parameter from the one or more page parameters, retrieving and inspecting the mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a portlet that generates a component of the page that is based, at least in part, on the portlet parameter* (pages 11 and 13:

whereas, a mapping is inspected to determine that a page parameter is mapped/associated to a portlet parameter)

*wherein the portlet is executable code that is operable to generate page components* (page 13: whereas the portlet is coded to execute/implement page components)

*passing a value associated with the page parameter as a value of the portlet parameter to the portlet that generates the component of the page (page 13: whereas a value is passed to the portlet parameter from the mapped value);*

*the portlet generating the component based upon the value associated with the portlet parameter; and inserting the component that was generated by the portlet into the page (page 7: whereas the portlet generates a component that is inserted into a region on the page).*

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches further comprising *the step of mapping the page parameter, wherein mapping the page parameter comprises the steps of: mapping the page parameter to a second portlet parameter associated with a second component of the page; and passing the value associated with the page parameter as the value of the second portlet parameter to a second portlet that generates the second component (page 11: whereas, multiple page parameters can be mapped to multiple portlet parameters, and whereas "other portlets on the page can use these parameters instead of defining them themselves". The one or more values can be passed to one or more portlets that generate component(s) of a page as shown on page 7).*

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches further comprising the steps of: *Establishing a plurality of page parameters for the page; and mapping the plurality of page parameters to a plurality of portlet parameters associated with the component of the page; wherein the step of inspecting the mapping further comprises the step of inspecting the mapping to determine which page parameters of the plurality of page parameters are mapped to each of the plurality of portlet parameters; wherein the step of passing the value further comprises the step of passing, based on the mapping, values associated with the plurality of page parameters as the values of the plurality of portlet parameters to the portlet that generates the component; and wherein the step of the portlet generating the component further comprises the step of the portlet generating the component based upon the values associated with the plurality of portlet parameters (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale).*

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches further comprising *the step of mapping the page parameter to the portlet parameter associated with the component of the page without mapping the page parameter to portlet parameters associated with any other components of the page (page 12: whereas an interface is used to specify the mapping of the page parameter to parameters associated to a specific portlet generating a component of the page).*

With regards to claim 5, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches further comprising

*the steps of mapping the page parameter to the portlet parameter and mapping a second page parameter to a second portlet parameter of the portlet that generates the component of the page (page 12: whereas, as shown, two parameters can be associated with a portlet that generates a component of the page, and also as shown, an interface is used to map page parameters to portlet parameters)*

With regards to claim 6, which depends on Claim 1, OracleW teaches further comprising the step of *establishing for the page parameter a default value, and wherein the step of passing the value associated with the page parameter further comprises the step of passing the default value as the value of the portlet parameter to the portlet that generates the component* (page 12: whereas as shown, a default value can be assigned using an interface).

With regards to claim 7, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches the method of Claim 1, *wherein the request to display the page includes a URL and the URL includes the value associated with the page parameter, and wherein the step of passing the value associated with the page parameter is performed by passing the value contained in the URL as the value of the portlet parameter* (page 13: whereas a URL includes the value associated with the page parameter).

With regards to claim 8, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches the steps of *presenting to a user a user interface for customizing the page; in response to the user*

*interacting with the user interface, obtaining a user specified value for the page parameter; and wherein the step of passing the value associated with the page parameter is performed by passing the user specified value as the value of the portlet parameter to the portlet that generates the component (page 12, whereas a user interface is used to obtain user specified data , and to pass the data to the portlet that generates the component).*

With regards to claim 9, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches wherein *a plurality of values are specified for the page parameter and wherein the method further comprises the step of determining a selected value from the plurality of values based on an override hierarchy; and the step of passing further comprises the step of passing the selected value as the value of the portlet parameter to the portlet that generates the component (page 12: whereas, a customize override value can be selected from a plurality of values when passing the value to the portlet).*

With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 9, OracleW teaches wherein the *plurality of values includes a URL page parameter value and a customized page parameter value and the override hierarchy specifies that the URL page parameter value is the selected value (page 13: wherein an order of precedence is used to specify the URL page parameter value is the selected value)*

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 9, OracleW teaches wherein the



*plurality of values includes a default page parameter value and a customized page parameter value and the override hierarchy specifies that the customized page parameter value is the selected value (page 13: whereas an override/precedence hierarchy is used to specify a selected value).*

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 9, OracleW teaches wherein the *plurality of values includes a default page parameter value and a portlet specified value and the override hierarchy specifies that the default page parameter value is the selected value (page 13: whereas an override/precedence hierarchy is used to specify a selected value)*

With regards claim 13, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches further comprising *the step of presenting to a page designer a user interface for specifying the mapping between the page parameter and the portlet parameter (page 12: whereas the user interface is shown)*

With regards to claim 14, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches *further comprising the step of registering the portlet with a portal repository, wherein the process of registering the portlet causes data associated with the portlet to be stored in the portal repository (pages 12 and 13: whereas data associated with a portlet is stored upon registration).*

With regards to claim 15, which depends on Claim 14, OracleW teaches *wherein the data associated with the portlet is communicated to the portal repository as an XML document* (page 12: *whereas data associated with the portlet is communicated as an XML document*).

With regards to claim 16, which depends on claim 1, OracleW teaches further comprising the step of *receiving input from a page designer, through a user interface, to create the mapping between the portlet parameter and the page parameter* (page 12: *whereas the interface is shown/implemented*)

With regards to claim 17, which depends on Claim 1, OracleW teaches wherein the *value associated with the page parameter is stored in memory and wherein the method further comprises the step of retrieving the stored value; and the step of the portlet generating the component further comprises the step of the portlet generating the component based upon the retrieved value* (page 13: *whereas the values, such as default values are retrieved from memory*)

With regards to claim 18, OracleW teaches a method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:  
*generating and storing a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters in response to a user manipulating a component associated with a page, a portlet that*

*previously generated the component generating a particular event, wherein the portlet is executable code that is operable to generate page components, the portlet passing data that represents the particular event to logic associated with the page; retrieving and inspecting [[a]] the first mapping that maps events to actions and event output parameters to page parameters; determining, based on the first mapping and the passed data, an action to perform in response to the particular event; inspecting the first mapping to determine that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter; and causing the action to be performed, wherein causing the action to be performed comprises passing a value of the event output parameter as the value of the page parameter (page 14: whereas a first mapping maps one or more events to one or more even output parameters, and the content/ components on the page are updated/action-performed using map data.)*

With regards to claim 19, which depends on Claim 18, OracleW teaches *causing the action to be performed*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 18, and is rejected under similar rationale. Additionally, OracleW teaches *the page is a first page and the page parameter is associated with a second page; and the step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of passing the value of the page parameter to logic responsible for rendering the second page* (page 14: whereas a particular page can be specified when the event is raised)

With regards to claim 20, which depends on Claim 18, OracleW teaches wherein the

*step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of generating a request that specifies a URL, wherein the value of the page parameter is included in the URL (page 14: whereas a URL is raised when an action is performed)*

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 20, OracleW teaches wherein the *step of generating the request further comprises the step of generating a request for executable code; and the step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of invoking the executable code (page 12: whereas the code / portlet is invoked)*

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 21, wherein the executable code is a *web service (pages 12-14: whereas web services with portal and portlet implementation include service registration, provision, and receipt / requesting services)*

With regards to claim 23, which depends on claim 18, OracleW teaches *the action*, and further teaches *wherein the action /request comprises rendering a second page, wherein the page parameter is associated with the second page (page 14: whereas a page parameter is associated with a particular page (such as a second page), and wherein rendering the second page comprises the steps of: inspecting a second mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a second portlet that generates a second component of the second page that is based, at least in part, on the portlet parameter; passing the value of the page parameter as the*

*value of the portlet parameter to the second portlet; the second portlet generating the second component based upon the value associated with the portlet parameter; and inserting the second component that was generated by the second portlet into the second page* (pages 7 and 14: whereas a second portlet generating a second component can be displayed on the second page).

With regards to claim 24, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 1, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 1.

With regards to claim 25, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 2, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim

With regards to claim 26, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 3, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 3.

With regards to 27, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more

sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 4, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 4.

With regards to 28, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 5, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 5.

With regards to 29, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 6, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 6.

With regards to 30, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 7, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 7.

With regards to 31, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 8, is rejected under

similar rationale as the rejection for claim 8.

With regards to 32, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 9, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 9.

With regards to 33, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 10, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 10.

With regards to 34, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 11, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 11.

With regards to 35, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 12, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 12.

With regards to 36, for a computer-readable storage medium one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 13, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 13.

With regards to 37, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 14, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 14.

With regards to 38, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 15, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 15.

With regards to 39, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 16, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 16.

With regards to 40, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the



one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 17, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 17.

With regards to 41, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 18, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 18.

With regards to 42, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 19, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 19.

With regards to 43, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 20, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 20.

With regards to 44, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 21, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 21.

With regards to 45, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 22, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 22.

With regards to 46, for a computer-readable storage medium storing one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in Claim 23, is rejected under similar rationale as the rejection for claim 23.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:  
10/600,284  
Art Unit: 2178

Page 18

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W. T. 1/18/08  
Wilson Tsui  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 2178  
January 18, 2008

  
CESAR PAULA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER